UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Court of Appeals

CHRISTINA CLEMENT and
HH EMPRESS QUEEN CHRISTINA LOCS IS OUR ARTIFACT OF FAITH

Plaintiff,

v.

Attorney General Merrick Garland;
Chief Justice John Roberts Jr.,
Secretary General of the United Nations;
Registrar-Peace Palace Carnegie Pleinz et al in their official capacity

Defendant,

Civil No: 1:24-cv-00479-RC
USCA CASE NUMBER 24-5263

MOTION TO EXPEDITE APPEAL

Plaintiff-Appellant Rev Dr Christina Clement; proceeding pro se, respectfully moves this Court to expedite the resolution of the above-captioned appeal pursuant to Rule 27 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and the inherent authority of the Court. This motion is made on the grounds that further delays will exacerbate ongoing legal damages and violate the constitutional right to a speedy resolution of judicial matters, as protected under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

ARGUMENT

1. **Delays Contravene Constitutional Rights**
   The culture of complacency towards delays in the judicial process undermines the constitutional right to a timely and fair adjudication. The original case sought a favorable decision before the federal election date of November 5, 2024. This specific request was based on the significant impact that a delayed decision would have on Plaintiff-Appellant's candidacy, rights, and public engagement. Missing that deadline has now compounded damages, affecting Plaintiff-Appellant’s ability to engage in subsequent related opportunities and to exercise constitutional and statutory rights.

- Undisputed Legal Authority: The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment ensures individuals the right to timely resolution of legal disputes (Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976)). The right to a speedy trial and adjudication is a fundamental principle underpinning the justice system (Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 530 (1972)).

2. **Failure to Comply with Statutory Requirements**
   The decision issued by the District Court, presided over by Judge Rudolph Contreras, failed to include the requisite findings of fact or conclusions of law. This deficiency constitutes a violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which mandate that judgments and orders include explicit legal and factual bases.

   - Undisputed Legal Authority: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a) requires that courts state findings of fact and conclusions of law in decisions to enable meaningful appellate review. The absence of such findings violates procedural fairness and due process rights (Anderson v. City of Bessemer City, 470 U.S. 564, 573-574 (1985)).

3. **Evidence Supporting Irregularities**
   Plaintiff-Appellant requests the Court's certification of the following documents as evidence to substantiate claims of judicial and procedural irregularities: a. The Oath of Office of Judge Rudolph Contreras; b. The Judicial Bond of Judge Contreras; c. Any applicable "minimus" or case assignment documentation concerning Judge Contreras and the assigned clerk.

   - Undisputed Legal Authority: Judicial officers are required to take an oath of office under 28 U.S.C. §453. The judicial bond serves as a safeguard of public accountability and ensures compliance with judicial duties.

4. **Legal Damages from Continued Delay**
   The ongoing delay has caused substantial legal and financial harm to Plaintiff-Appellant. This includes but is not limited to the erosion of political opportunities, reputational harm, and the inability to rely on timely judicial redress as part of the electoral process. Such delays have created a chilling effect on Plaintiff-Appellant's ability to seek effective relief in the future.

   - Undisputed Legal Authority: Delays that result in material harm to litigants contravene the requirement of prompt resolution as upheld in Klopfer v. North Carolina, 386 U.S. 213, 223 (1967). Timely adjudication is particularly critical in cases involving public and electoral matters (Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1, 4-5 (2006)).

5. **Request for Expedited Resolution**
   Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully requests that this Court expedite the resolution of the

appeal to address these substantial and ongoing harms. Expediting the appeal is not only consistent with the Court's duty to uphold the constitutional right to due process but is also necessary to ensure the integrity and timeliness of judicial review.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Issue a ruling on the merits of the appeal at the earliest possible date;
2. Order the certification and production of the following documents: a. The Oath of Office of Judge Rudolph Contreras; b. The Judicial Bond of Judge Contreras; c. Applicable minimus or case assignment documentation.
3. Grant requested relief in both case 1:24 cv 00479 RC and Appeal 245263 such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

"Rev. Dr. Christina Clement,
8 The Green, Suite 21215

Dover, DE 19901

678-780-5557

Rule 5 (c) Signing. A filing made through a person's electronic –filing account and authorized by that person, together with that person's name on a signature block, constitutes the person's signature.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 16, 2024, I mailed the foregoing to the Clerk of the Court using the address 333 Constitution Ave, NW Washington DC 20001, which clerk will send notice to all parties.

"CHRISTINA CLEMENT